		Application No.	P	Applicant(s)		
Examiner-Initiated Interview Sumn	2011	10/751,259		HEMBREE ET AL.		
	mary	Examiner	A	Art Unit		
		Charles G. Freay	3	746		
All Participants:		Status of Applicatio	n: <u>pendi</u>	ng		
(1) Charles G. Freay.		(3)				
(2) <u>Joshua Randall</u> .		(4)				
Date of Interview: 27 April 2006		Time: <u>12:30 pm</u>				
Type of Interview:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant  Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes If Yes, provide a brief description:	☐ Applica	ant's representative)				
Part I.						
Rejection(s) discussed:						
Claims dissussed:						
Claims discussed: . 1 and 18			•			
Prior art documents discussed:  Klein et al (USPN 5,641,275)						
Part II.						
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING TH See Continuation Sheet	IE GENE	RAL NATURE OF WHAT	rwas d	ISCUSSED:		
Part III.						
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s directly resulted in the allowance of the applic of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a s did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief</li> </ul>	ation. The	e examiner will provide a record of the substance of	a written of the int	summary of the erview, since	he substance	
	<del> </del>					
(Examiner/SPE Signature) (	Applican	/Applicant's Representat	tive Signa	ature – if appr	opriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: After considering the applicant's argumenst with regards to a separate thrust ring in the March 3, 2006 amendment the examiner agreed that if the noted claims made clear that the thrust ring was a separate member then the claims would be favorably considered. The examiner prosed changes to claims 1 and 18 which included references to a containment shell hub, thus making clear that the claimed thrust ring was a separate element. The applicant agreed to the changes as set forth in the attached Examiner's Amendment..